

EXHIBIT 7



Robert D. Becker
Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP
Direct Dial: (415) 291-7616
rbecker@manatt.com

March 4, 2021

VIA E-MAIL (john.gaustad@baketbotts.com)

John Gaustad
Baker Botts LLP
1001 Page Mill Road
Building One, Suite 200
Palo Alto CA 94304

Re: Capella Photonics, Inc. v. Infinera Corp. et al., No. 2:20-cv-77-JRG (E.D. Tex.)

Dear John:

I write in response to your February 26, 2021 letter regarding Capella's document production and written discovery responses. I am available to meet and confer on these issues tomorrow afternoon, March 5, 2021. Please let me know a time that is best for you.

With regards to the document production, Capella confirms that it has produced all responsive documents in its possession, custody or control. Specifically, Capella does not possess (i) a copy of any agreement between Capella and Joseph Davis, (ii) a copy of the settlement agreement between Capella and Jeffrey Wilde, (iii) any other documents related to the valuation of Capella or Capella's patents not already produced, (iv) documents showing the purchase price allocation of the Alcatel-Lucent Purchase Agreement, or (v) any other documents related to the Alcatel-Lucent Purchase Agreement not already produced. As for the documents in the possession of Jeffrey Wilde, those documents were produced in response to Infinera's document requests on December 2, 2020. *See* CAPELLA 031789 - CAPELLA 033396.

As for Capella's written discovery, Capella stands by its responses. First, Capella's interrogatory responses are complete and accurate. To the extent Capella must supplement its responses, it will do so prior to the close of discovery. Second, there is no basis for Infinera to assert that Capella's responses to the requests for admission were not in good faith. As stated in our February 10, 2021 email concerning the authentication RFAs, Capella's responses were based on its inability to authenticate the uncertified documents produced by Infinera, as well as several errors or misrepresented documents in Infinera's requests. For example, Request No. 102 asks Capella to admit that "Capella_Infinera_000084145 is an authentic copy of U.S. Patent No. RE42,678" but Capella_Infinera_000084145 is U.S. Patent No. RE47,906, thus Capella denied the request. Other similar misrepresentations occurred throughout Infinera's requests. Capella likewise responded in good faith to the non-authentication RFAs based on the best of its knowledge.

manatt

John Gaustad, Esq.

March 4, 2021

Page 2

I look forward to discussing these issues with you tomorrow.

Sincerely,

/s/ Robert D. Becker

Robert D. Becker